

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

2
3
4
5

7

8

9

10

12
13
14

15	
16	

17

18	
19	

21

22

23

24

25

1 as discussed in the arguments below. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for
2 agreeing to issue another Office action in this case.

3
4 **35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

5 Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being
6 anticipated by Korhammer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

7 A computer-implemented method for trading financial
8 products, the method comprising:

9 in a first communication channel, streaming offering data for
10 a plurality of different financial products from a server to a trading
11 terminal;

12 in a second communication channel, receiving a request for
13 offer details relating to a first one of the plurality of financial
14 products, the request comprising a user-specified constraint
15 identifying a desired characteristic of the first financial product;

16 determining offering information for the first product based
17 on the user-specified constraint; and

18 in the second communication channel, transmitting
19 information relating to the specific product to the trading terminal.

20 Korhammer does not disclose the computer-implemented method of claim
21 1. Rather, Korhammer describes streaming market information from several
22 electronic communication networks (ECNs) and electronic exchanges (such as
23 NASDAQ) to a user through a consolidated computer system (CCS) 100.
24 (*Korhammer*, Col. 6, lines 51-63). Before reaching the user, the streamed
25 information from the different ECNs and electronic exchanges is converted in the
CCS 110 to a common protocol, and combined into a single stream. (*Korhammer*,
Col. 7, lines 21-37).

1 This newly created stream of market information is then filtered based on
2 the user's permission level, analyzed based on the user's preferences, and sent
3 over a first path to the user's terminal via a protocol converter and integrator 207.
4 (*Korhammer*, Col. 7, line 43- Col. 8, line 18 and Fig. 3). If the user is not a
5 NASDAQ market maker or user, the filtered and analyzed information is provided
6 to the user's trading terminal 101 via a subscriber server 205 and a protocol
7 converter and integrator 207. (*Korhammer*, Col. 7, line 52- Col. 8, line 10 and
8 Fig. 3). Alternately, if the user is a NASDAQ market maker or user, the user's
9 NASDAQ information feed can be fed to the user's terminal 101 directly from
10 NASDAQ through the protocol converter and integrator 207. (*Korhammer*, Col. 8,
11 lines 9-18).

12 When the user wishes to accept orders or execute orders with some of the
13 market makers or ECNs, the user places an order over a second path (separate
14 from either of the available first paths), and the order is sent from the trading
15 terminal 101 to an order server 211 without passing through the protocol converter
16 and integrator 207. (*Korhammer*, Col. 8, lines 39-46 and Fig. 3).

17 If the user's order is accepted or rejected, execution and
18 confirmation/rejection information for the order is streamed to the user's terminal
19 101 along with the streaming market information over the first path, via the a
20 subscriber server 205 and a protocol converter and integrator 207. (*Korhammer*,
21 Col. 7, lines 21-25, and Col. 12, lines 8-30).

22 Consequently, according to *Korhammer*, the user receives both streamed
23 market information and confirmation and/or rejection information regarding any
24
25

1 orders placed by the user over a first path. The second path, as described in
2 Korhammer, is only used by the user when the user places an order.

3 In rejecting claim 1, the Office relies on Col.8 lines 40-45 as disclosing in a
4 second channel, receiving a request for offer details relating to a first one of the
5 plurality of financial products, the request comprising a user-specified constraint
6 identifying a desired characteristic of the first financial product. Further, the
7 Office relies on Col. 9, lines 50-55 as disclosing in the second channel,
8 transmitting information relating to the specific product to the trading terminal.
9 (*Office Action*, Page 4).

10 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the user in
11 Korhammer places an order over the *second* path (i.e. from the trading terminal
12 101 to an order server 211 without passing through the protocol converter and
13 integrator 207). Then, execution information -- including confirmation or failure
14 information regarding the order -- is streamed with streaming market information
15 to the user's terminal 101, over the *first* path (i.e. through the protocol converter
16 and integrator 207).

17 Therefore, Korhammer does not disclose "in a second communication
18 channel, receiving a request for offer details relating to a first one of the plurality
19 of financial products, the request comprising a user-specified constraint
20 identifying a desired characteristic of the first financial product" and "in the
21 second communication channel, transmitting information relating to the specific
22 product to the trading terminal" as recited in claim 1.

23 Accordingly, since Korhammer does not disclose or show all of the
24 elements of claim 1, the §102(e) anticipation rejection of claim 1 based on
25

1 Korhammer is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the
2 §102(e) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

3 **Dependent claims 2-4 and 6** are allowable at the least by virtue of their
4 dependency on base claim 1, as well as for the additional elements they contain.
5 Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(e) rejection of claims 2-4 and 6 be
6 withdrawn.

7
8 **Independent claim 7** recites:

9 A computer system for providing financial product offerings
10 over a network, the system comprising:

11 a computer server accessible to a trading terminal over
a communications network; and

12 executable software stored on the server operative to
configuring the server to:

13 stream data relating to multiple product
offerings over a first communication channel to the trading
14 terminal;

15 receive a request for details relating to a specific
product over a second communication channel that is
logically separate from the first communication channel;

16 transmit information over the second
communication channel relating to the specific product;

17 receive an order over the second
communication channel relating to the specific product; and

18 associate different processing priorities with
19 data transmitted over the first channel compared to data
transmitted over the second channel.
20

21 Korhammer fails to disclose the computer system of claim 7.

22 In particular, as discussed more fully above in conjunction with claim 1,
23 Korhammer discloses receiving streamed market information and
24 confirmation/rejection information regarding any orders placed by the user over a
25

1 first path. This is not the same as “receive a request for details relating to a
2 specific product over a second communication channel that is logically separate
3 from the first communication channel”, “transmit information over the second
4 communication channel relating to the specific product” and “receive an order
5 over the second communication channel relating to the specific product” as recited
6 in claim 7.

7 In rejecting claim 7, the Office relies on Col. 7, lines 20-55 as disclosing
8 receive a request for details relating to a specific product over a second
9 communication channel that is logically separate from the first communication
10 channel and transmit information over the second communication channel relating
11 to the specific product. (*Office Action*, Page 5).

12 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, orders in
13 Korhammer are received over the second path (i.e. from the trading terminal 101
14 to an order server 211 without passing through the protocol converter and
15 integrator 207), while execution information -- including confirmation or failure
16 information regarding the orders -- is transmitted with market information to the
17 user’s terminal 101, over the first path (i.e. through the protocol converter and
18 integrator 207).

19 Thus Korhammer fails to disclose “receive a request for details relating to a
20 specific product over a second communication channel that is logically separate
21 from the first communication channel”, “transmit information over the second
22 communication channel relating to the specific product” and “receive an order
23 over the second communication channel relating to the specific product” as recited
24 in claim 7.
25

1 Accordingly, since Korhammer does not disclose or show all of the
2 elements of claim 7, the §102(e) anticipation rejection of claim 7 based on
3 Korhammer is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the
4 §102(e) rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

5
6 **Independent claim 10** recites:

7
8 A computer-implemented method for trading financial
9 products, the method comprising:
10 receiving at a trading terminal from a server a first
11 communication channel comprising a stream of offering data for a
12 plurality of different financial products,
13 displaying the offering data to a user;
14 receiving from a user a selection of a first one of the financial
15 products and a parameter
16 modifying a characteristic of the selected financial product;
17 establishing a second communication channel to the server
18 and transmitting over the second communication channel a request
19 for an offer for the selected financial products as modified by the
20 parameter;
21 determining offering information for the first product based
22 on the parameter and
23 transmitting the offering information over the second
24 communication channel in response to the request for an offer;
25 displaying the offering information at the terminal using a
display format logically separating information received in the first
and second communication channels.

20 Korhammer fails to disclose the computer-implemented method of claim
21 10.

22 In particular, as discussed more fully above in conjunction with claims 1
23 and 7, Korhammer discloses receiving both market information and order
24 confirmation/rejection information over a first path.
25

1 In rejecting claim 10, the Office relies on the same rationale used for
2 rejecting claim 1, i.e. Col. 6, line 50 – Col. 7, line 20; Col. 8, lines 40-45; Col. 7,
3 lines 5-14; and Col. 9, lines 50-55. (*Office Action*, Page 6).

4 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, the user in Korhammer
5 places an order over the second path (i.e. from the trading terminal 101 to an order
6 server 211 without passing through the protocol converter and integrator 207),
7 while both market information and order confirmation/failure information are
8 streamed to the user's terminal 101, over the first path (i.e. through the protocol
9 converter and integrator 207).

10 Thus Korhammer fails to disclose “establishing a second communication
11 channel to the server and transmitting over the second communication channel a
12 request for an offer for the selected financial products as modified by the
13 parameter” and “transmitting the offering information over the second
14 communication channel in response to the request for an offer” as recited in claim
15 10.

16 Accordingly, since Korhammer does not disclose or show all of the
17 elements of claim 10, the §102(e) anticipation rejection of claim 10 based on
18 Korhammer is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the
19 §102(e) rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Amended independent claim 11** recites:

2 A computer-readable data storage apparatus comprising
3 instructions to configure a computer system to:

4 stream offering data in a first communication channel to a
trading terminal for a plurality of different financial products;

5 receive a request in a second communication channel for offer
6 details relating to a first one of the plurality of financial products, the
request comprising a user-specified constraint identifying a desired
characteristic of the first financial product;

7 determine offering information for the first product based on
the user-specified constraint; and

8 transmit in the second communication channel to the trading
9 terminal information relating to the specific product.

10 Korhammer fails to disclose the computer-readable data storage apparatus
11 of claim 11.

12 In particular, as discussed more fully above in conjunction with claims 1, 7
13 and 10, Korhammer discloses receiving both market information and order
14 confirmation/rejection information over a first path.

15 In rejecting claim 11, the Office relies on the same rationale used in the
16 rejection of claim 1, i.e. Col. 6, line 50 – Col. 7, line 20; Col. 8, lines 40-45; Col.
17 7, lines 5-14; and Col. 9, lines 50-55. (*Office Action*, Page 6).

18 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, the user in Korhammer
19 places an order over the second path (i.e. from the trading terminal 101 to an order
20 server 211 without passing through the protocol converter and integrator 207),
21 while both market information and order confirmation/failure information are
22 streamed to the user's terminal 101, over the first path (i.e. through the protocol
23 converter and integrator 207).

1 Thus Korhammer fails to disclose “receive a request in a second
2 communication channel for offer details relating to a first one of the plurality of
3 financial products, the request comprising a user-specified constraint identifying a
4 desired characteristic of the first financial product;” and “transmit in the second
5 communication channel to the trading terminal information relating to the specific
6 product” as recited in claim 11.

7 Accordingly, since Korhammer does not disclose or show all of the
8 elements of claim 11, the §102(e) anticipation rejection of claim 11 based on
9 Korhammer is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the
10 §102(e) rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

11
12 **Dependent claims 12-14** are allowable at the least by virtue of their
13 dependency on base claim 11, as well as for the additional elements they contain.
14 Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(e) rejection of claims 12-14 be
15 withdrawn.

16
17 **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

18 The remaining claims (claims 5, 8, 9 and 15) are rejected under a set of §103
19 rejections, all of which rely on Korhammer as the primary reference. Moreover,
20 all of these claims depend from base claims addressed above. Applicant
21 respectfully traverses the rejections.

1 **Korhammer + Elements Well-Known in the Art Cited by the Office**

2 Claims 5, 8, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
3 unpatentable over Korhammer in view of elements well-known in the art cited by
4 the Office. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

5 Claims 5, 8, 9 and 15 depend from respective independent claims 1, 7 and
6 11. As such, they include the features recited in those base claims. The
7 combination of Korhammer and elements well-known in the art cited by the Office
8 fails to teach or suggest the features of these base claims from which claims 5, 8, 9
9 and 15 depend.

10 With respect to **dependent claim 5**, neither Korhammer nor elements well-
11 known in the art as cited by the Office disclose, teach or suggest “in a second
12 communication channel, receiving a request for offer details relating to a first one
13 of the plurality of financial products, the request comprising a user-specified
14 constraint identifying a desired characteristic of the first financial product” and “in
15 the second communication channel, transmitting information relating to the
16 specific product to the trading terminal” as recited in claim 1 from which claim 5
17 depends.

18 Instead, as discussed above, orders in Korhammer are received over a
19 second path (i.e. from the trading terminal 101 to an order server 211 without
20 passing through the protocol converter and integrator 207), while execution
21 information -- including confirmation or failure information regarding the order --
22 are transmitted with market information to the user’s terminal 101 over a first path
23 (i.e. through the protocol converter and integrator 207).
24
25

1 Elements well-known in the prior art cited by the Office offer no missing
2 teachings. Accordingly, the combination of Korhammer and elements well-known
3 in the prior art cited by the Office fails to teach or suggest the computer-
4 implemented method of claim 5. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103
5 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

6 With respect to **dependant claims 8-9**, neither Korhammer nor elements
7 well-known in the prior art as cited by the Office disclose, teach or suggest
8 "receive a request for details relating to a specific product over a second
9 communication channel that is logically separate from the first communication
10 channel" and "transmit information over the second communication channel
11 relating to the specific product" as recited in claim 7 from which claims 8-9
12 depend.

13 Instead, as discussed above, orders in Korhammer are received over a
14 second path, while execution information -- including confirmation or failure
15 information regarding the orders -- are transmitted with market information to the
16 user's terminal 101 over a first path (i.e. through the protocol converter and
17 integrator 207).

18 Again, elements well-known in the art cited by the Office offer no missing
19 teaching. Accordingly, the combination of Korhammer and elements well-known
20 in the prior art cited by the Office fails to teach or suggest the computer
21 communications systems of claims 8-9. Applicant respectfully requests that the
22 §103 rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

23 With respect to **dependant claim 15**, neither Korhammer nor the elements
24 well-known in the prior art as cited by the Office teach or suggest "receive a
25

1 request in a second communication channel for offer details relating to a first one
2 of the plurality of financial products, the request comprising a user-specified
3 constraint identifying a desired characteristic of the first financial product;" and
4 "transmit in the second communication channel to the trading terminal information
5 relating to the specific product" as recited in claim 11 from which claim 15
6 depends.

7 Instead, as discussed above, the user in Korhammer places an order over
8 the second path (i.e. from the trading terminal 101 to an order server 211 without
9 passing through the protocol converter and integrator 207), while both market
10 information and order confirmation/failure information are streamed to the user's
11 terminal 101, over the first path (i.e. through the protocol converter and integrator
12 207).

13 Again, elements well-known in the art cited by the Office offer no missing
14 teaching. Accordingly, the combination of Korhammer and elements well-known
15 in the prior art cited by the Office fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim
16 15. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 15 be
17 withdrawn.

1 CONCLUSION

2 The Applicant submits that all of the remaining claims are in condition for
3 allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the
4 Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
5 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
6 purpose of scheduling an interview.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10 Dated: 1-30-07

By:  45988

11 Jim Patterson
12 Reg. No. 52,103
13 Attorney for Applicant

14 LEE & HAYES PLLC
15 Suite 500
16 421 W. Riverside Avenue
17 Spokane, Washington 99201
18 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x247
19 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
20
21
22
23
24
25